DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 032 269 SP 003 052

By-Bhaerman, Robert D.
Which Way for Teacher Certification? QuEST Papers Series, #2.
American Federation of Teachers, Washington, D.C.
Pub Date 69
Note-13p.; Reprint from AMERICAN TEACHER, February 1969.
Available from-American Federation of Teachers, Department of Research, 1012 14th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005 ($0.20)
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.75
Descriptors-Agency Role, Teacher Associations, *Teacher Certification
Identifiers-AFT, American Federation of Teachers

The American Federation of Teachers (AFT) has no comprehensive policy and philosophy for the certification of teachers. Six issues have most relevance to a more inclusive position: The union should review its resolution regarding certification based on "general education" in light of changes in the professional and academic specialization components of most preservice programs. On the question of temporary or emergency certification, the AFT should remain flexible but encourage its locals to establish standards or floors since the issue is so closely related to local needs. On the question of certification renewal, it must resolve problems regarding such projected innovations as evaluation of competency, levels of certification, and differentiated staffing. It must face issues related to "certification by examination" and to "program-approval certification," a better approach than the traditional course credit counting though it also poses problems. Finally, the AFT must study its role as the teachers union, not only regarding the issue of who shall determine certification standards but of what the real purposes of certification are. Apparently, qualified teachers should be licensed for a 3-year probationary period (to prevent incompetent persons from becoming teachers), but that certification requirements should not be manipulated to adjust the supply and demand of teachers or to enforce continued updating of professional knowledge and skills. (JS)

ED032269

AFT QuEST Paper 2. Occassional Papers from the AFT Program for Quality Educational Standards in Teaching (QuEST)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

WHAT IS THE AFT-QuEST PROGRAM?

Persistent and emerging problems face the nation's schools:

Effective teaching
Use of paraprofessionals
Decentralization and community control
Teacher education and certification
Implementation of the More Effective Schools concept
Eradicating racism in education

As the teacher revolution sweeps through urban America, the American Federation of Teachers becomes increasingly aware of its special responsibilities to offer solutions to these other problems. In January, 1968, the AFT's executive council, with representatives on it from most of the nation's big cities, held a special two-day conference to consider these problems and the AFT's responsibilities.

Out of this conference came a mandate for a *continuing body of active and concerned AFT educators* who could—

Anticipate some of the emerging problems resulting from the rapid social changes in our society;

Meet on a regular basis;

Stimulate and initiate confrontations between teachers and these problems at state, local, and national levels;

Organize and coordinate regional and national conferences;

Prepare tentative positions for action by AFT legislative bodies; and

Suggest action programs to implement their findings.

Thus was born QuEST.

Reports on QuEST conferences are published regularly in a QuEST Reports series. Papers on topics of current educational concern are available in a QuEST Papers series. For a list of Reports and Papers currently available, write:

Department of Research
American Federation of Teachers
1012 14th St. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005.

SP00 3052

WHICH WAY FOR TEACHER CERTIFICATION?

(Reprinted from *American Teacher* - February, 1969)

AFT's research director examines the current, sometimes confusing, controversy surrounding teacher certification and offers some personal reactions to recent proposals.

By Dr. Robert D. Bhaerman
AFT Director of Research

A great deal of controversy and disagreement surrounds the issue of teacher certification. For example, Michael Moskow has written that if teacher organizations are truly interested in hiring standards, the way to accomplish this is to change statewide requirements for certification. He holds that collective bargaining at the local level will be inapplicable to solving this problem.[1] On the other hand, Dr. Alvin Lierheimer, formerly director of teacher education and certification and currently assistant commissioner for higher education in New York, points out the inconsistency of professional associations which seek, as he puts it, "more power to set standards of certification themselves and at the same time pass resolutions urging the state to mandate additional courses for teachers."[2]

Since 1958, the AFT has passed only four resolutions dealing directly with certification at its conventions. We actually do not have a comprehensive policy or underlying philosophy for the certification of teachers, and many believe it is time we remedied this.

The resolutions, omitting the introductory "whereas" sections, and brief after-sections comments, are as follows:

(1) RESOLVED: That we propose that the certification of teachers be based upon general education; and be it further

RESOLVED: That we propose a minimum of a bachelor's degree or equivalent on all levels. (1958)

Frankly, it is difficult to conceive that the AFT really meant to say this about general education. As it is used most commonly, the term refers to the block of the so-called "liberal arts" credits in the four college years. The typical structure of a 120-credit-hour teacher-education program is approximately 20 credits in professional education, 40 credits in the academic specialization, and 60 credits in general education. Therefore, one can question the concept that the certification of teachers be based solely upon "general education," if that was the intent.

(2) RESOLVED: That the AFT reaffirm its resolutions adopted in 1958 requiring a bachelor's degree or its equivalent for certification of all teachers, and be it further

RESOLVED: That no person be employed even under a temporary certificate who has not completed his bachelor's degree. (1959)

It can also be questioned, 10 years after this resolution was passed, whether either "resolve" represents a meaningful and realistic policy in light of the changes taking place in teacher education, e.g., the increased use of the internship approach for entrance into teaching and the movement to utilize auxiliary personnel in instructional or quasi-instructional roles in the classroom.

(3) RESOLVED: That the American Federation of Teachers reaffirm its policy that a bachelor's degree from an accredited institution of higher learning remain a minimum educational prerequisite to teacher certification and be it further

RESOLVED: That member locals of the American Federation of Teachers be encouraged to promote programs of certification embodying reciprocal terms. (1959, revised 1961)

The portion of this resolution dealing with certification reciprocity needs little added comment. Some type of meaningful interstate certification is necessary and it is good to see that the AFT recognized this a number of years ago.

(4) RESOLVED: That the AFT in convention assembled endorse the drive for certification of teachers by teachers in all 50 states. (1961)

The briefest resolution of the four also is probably the most significant in that it deals with the basic issue: the role of the Federation in affecting changes in certification process and procedure. More will follow on this important point.

OTHER STATEMENTS

These four somewhat general resolutions constitute the written AFT policy on certification. I do not believe, however, that we are guilty of what Dr. Lierheimer pointed out . . . but only because our resolutions reflect little of the depth of this complex issue. A handful of other resolutions exist which indirectly are relevant to this issue; for example, one critical of the so-called "professional practices acts" (1963), one guarding us to be alert to "pseudo-teacher-training programs which lower professional standards" (1963), and one recently supported by the AFT executive council which calls upon state federations to support and initiate legislation providing for the category of Credential in Special Competence in order to expedite the hiring of such professionals as language pathologists, artists, musicians, actors, conservationists, and programmers, presently not qualified to serve in the public schools due to credentialing procedures. The last comes as close as we have to exerting pressure upon state education departments.

It is necessary to discuss several specific certification problems in order that we may begin to establish a more inclusive policy and philosophy of certification. A wide variety of problems exists, e.g., the confusion over the number and names and types of certificates, certification of private and parochial school teachers, certification of teachers in federal teacher-related programs, and the role of NCATE. However, there are six

major issues which have the most relevance to the AFT. Because we have supported certification embodying reciprocal terms, it is being omitted in this article; the problem is, nevertheless, a practical one for each state to consider.

• The question of balance in the requirements for preservice teachers. For elementary-school teachers, the requirements in professional education for certification among the states range from 16 to 36 semester hours; the median requirement is 21. For high-school teachers, the range is from 12 to 29 semester hours; the median is 18. Thus, state requirements typically specify about 20 percent of curriculum for elementary-school teachers, and 15 percent for high-school teachers, to be in education courses. For academic fields of specialization, state requirements seem to be moving toward concentration in a teaching major and minor of approximately 36 to 24 semester hours respectively, which leaves nearly one-half of the degree program for general education.[3]

In light of this, I believe it is appropriate for the AFT to review the resolution which states that the certification of teachers be based upon general education. We need to formulate a position on the appropriate elements in the preparation of a teacher. Professional education and academic specialization should not be overlooked.

A related problem here is the amount of education necessary beyond the initial preparation. In a recent survey, a total of 18 states reported that progression in preparation for teachers at either the elementary- or secondary-school level to the fifth year or master's degree is mandated within a specified number of years for the next highest certificate. Ten states reported the mandated time period for completion: California--elementary and secondary teachers must complete the fifth year within seven and five years, respectively; Connecticut, Kentucky, and Maryland--elementary and secondary teachers, within 10 years; Indiana and Michigan--must complete the fifth year within five years; New York--both must complete the fifth year within five years, with 10 years being allowed in some special fields; Oregon--secondary teachers are required to complete the master's degree in six years; Pennsylvania--both must complete 24 semester hours beyond the bachelor's degree within six years; Rhode Island--elementary, secondary, and junior college teachers are required to complete the fifth year within six years.[4]

TEMPORARY CERTIFICATION

• The question of temporary or emergency certification. Only a handful of states--Arizona, Hawaii, Kansas, Massachusetts, North Carolina, North Dakota, and Oregon--have reported that emergency certificates are not issued.[5] The remainder of the states report some variations in the issuance of an emergency or temporary certificate. This safety valve or escape hatch continues to be widely used by state departments of education. The reasons seem predicated upon the inability to find enough qualified teachers to fill all jobs. This is based upon a certain degree of logic. But it is a logic of expediency, often grossly abused.

Since the use of the emergency certificate is so closely tied in with local needs, this issue should be dealt with at the local level, or so it

seems to me. I believe and recommend (Michael Moskow notwithstanding) that AFT locals consider establishing standards or floors in the certification of temporary teachers. We must be concerned with maintaining high standards in certification; yet we should not be closed-minded on this (or any) issue. Research findings are inconclusive on the relationship between the certification level and the proficiency of teachers. The entire area needs a great deal more research analysis. But, since all the returns are not in yet, I believe we should be as flexible as possible in adhering to the 1959 resolution dealing with temporary certification. As noted above, numerous changes are taking place in education today. One of the most widespread innovations is the increased use of auxiliary personnel for instructional or quasi-instructional activities. As a matter of fact, the 1968 AFT convention submitted the following two resolutions to the executive council, which subsequently has recommended concurrence.

(1) RESOLVED: That the AFT actively support the use of both men and women of minority-group background in paraprofessional positions, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the AFT continue to support a program to enable these men and women to participate in paraprofessional duties while improving their educational potential as fully trained and certificated professionals in their own right.

(2) RESOLVED: That teachers should be offered the services of paraprofessionals, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the responsibility of paraprofessionals is to assist teachers by performing functions which are assigned and directed by these teachers, without infringing upon the professional responsibilities reserved for certificated teachers.

While only five states currently have indicated certification provisions for auxiliary personnel,[6] this surely is an issue which must be faced by the AFT.

QUESTION OF RENEWAL

• The question of certification renewal and its implications. Twenty-six states issue life or permanent certificates. However, the permanent certificate usually is not a life certificate but remains valid only as long as the holder teaches continuously or is not out of teaching beyond a specified number of years. Of the 26 states, four and the District of Columbia issue this type (Connecticut, Georgia, Louisiana, and South Dakota).[7]

This means, of course, that in the remainder of the 24 states, some form of certification renewal is mandatory. Perhaps the most interesting and, in many ways, shocking activity along these lines comes out of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. A number of statements appeared in the June, 1968, report of the Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education, some of which must be presented in their entirety for full impact.[8]

"1. Provisions should be made for periodic renewals of licenses, without reference to tenure, based on demonstrated maintenance of scholarship and professional competence. Suggested renewal points are: internship licenses--annually; associate-teacher licenses--every three years; professional licenses and educational specialists--every seven years. (p. 14 of the report)

"2. Full and continuing protection against professional incompetence requires periodic checks to make certain that certified personnel keep up to date in knowledge and effective in performance. To protect against professional obsolescence, the renewal of all certificates needs to be required at periodic intervals. Decisions to extend licenses to practice should be based upon judgments of adequate professional performance at the level of certification. (p. 60)

"3. Failure to maintain the level of performance for licensure could result in nonrenewal, thus disqualification. In some instances, however, when the failure is inability to perform at an advanced professional level, such as professional specialists, it may be decided to reduce the level of license to that of performance capabilities. Thus, a professional teacher who fails to maintain competence to perform independently might be licensed as an associate teacher and permitted to work under supervision." (p. 72)

Besides the question of obsolescence of skills and certification renewal, many other implications arise from the Massachusetts report. In addition to this key issue of certification renewal, the AFT must face and resolve problems arising from such projected innovations as evaluation of competencies, levels of certification, and differentiated staff.

It is trite to say that teachers must be continuously alert to the many new insights into educational theory, the learning process, and curriculum and methodology. Teachers, obviously, must never stop growing or they are dead. A way must be found to assure this growth. The question simply is not whether they do or whether they do not. It is: What is the fairest, most mature, and most professional way to insure professional growth? Obsolescence can be overcome, I feel, without the rigid restriction imposed by rigid certification levels and forced renewal.

I believe that forced certification renewal in order to offset obsolescence is unwarranted, unnecessary, and unprofessional for teachers. Instead, obsolescence can be prevented by negotiating collective-bargaining contracts with provisions for the updating of teachers' skills and knowledge. A meaningful inservice program is the alternative to forced renewal.

THE EXAMINATION BOX

• The question of certification by examination. A recent survey disclosed that six states use qualifying examinations to a very limited extent. Examinations are used in several states to validate degrees from unaccredited institutions and to renew emergency certificates. Eight states and the District of Columbia use proficiency examinations to enable applicants to substitute scores

on certain subjects in lieu of course credit (California, Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, New York, Pennsylvania, Vermont, and Wyoming).[9]

The Educational Testing Service reports that the National Teacher Examination is used by states in a variety of ways, e.g. (1) awarding regular certificates; (2) determining grade of regular certificates; (3) renewing provisional certificates; (4) adding teaching fields to regular certificates previously issued by the state; (5) evaluating credentials of regular-certificate applicants with atypical patterns of education; (6) validating credits earned toward regular certificates at unaccredited institutions; (7) in lieu of course requirements for regular certification in certain fields; (8) validating credits earned toward advanced certificates; (9) obtaining objective data for statewide teacher-education studies; and (10) awarding state grants for study beyond the bachelor's degree.

The issue of certification by examination was one of the three discussed at the initial QuEST hearings in August, 1968, at the AFT convention in Cleveland. Dr. Allan F. Rosebrock, director of teacher education and certification in New Jersey, one of the participants called upon to testify, raised five questions which must be considered by anyone who faces this issue:

- What kinds of proficiency are relevant to teacher certification?

- Are these kinds of proficiency subject to determination by written tests or are other types of testing required?

- What kinds of tests are useful in getting at these kinds of proficiency?

- Are we talking about using tests in addition to the requirement of completion of an accredited college program (as in law or medicine) or as a substitute for completing an accredited program of teacher preparation?

- Who should administer the tests and pass judgment on the applicant's proficiency?[10]

It is this last question, particularly, which the AFT must resolve as the issue is confronted. While the issue is a complex one, as are all those in this certification dilemma, Dr. Rosebrock has given helpful insights into the resolution of the problem when he distinguishes between proficiency and performance testing. He writes,

"The test experts themselves warn of the limitation of tests as a single measure of competence, and plead with us not to use the test scores in isolation or as the sole basis of the identification of talent. I think we should take this advice of the experts very seriously.

"Great strides have been made in recent years, by groups such as the Modern Language Association, in developing tests for the measurement of competence in performance, as well as knowledge of facts and principles. Colleges are using these examinations in increasing numbers. We should do everything we can to encourage the development of these performance tests, and promote their effective and widespread use."[11]

PROGRAM-APPROVAL APPROACH

• The question of program approval. Certification is usually thought to be an attempt to maintain minimum standards of competence. Traditionally, the way of trying to describe this competence has been by counting the number of semester hours of college credit earned in specific courses. In the past, this counting has been done by nonprofessionals in bureaus of teacher certification. Unfortunately, since time spent sitting in a classroom does not guarantee that sutdents learn, and since two courses with identical titles may have nothing in common other than the title, credit-counting does not insure uniform standards. The mere accumulation of college credits or degrees is not a guarantee of competency. The program-approval concept is an attempt to resolve these dilemmas. A brief description of this approach follows.

Logically, a better way to check on the education of a future teacher is to visit the campus and attempt to determine whether the experiences provided are of high quality. It is wiser to evaluate each teaching program of specialty before the prospective teacher passes through it. If the program is known to be good, then one who takes it can be automatically certificated. The institution identifies a student as a graduate of the program and "endorses" or recommends him to the state certification agency. This is the approach which is followed in many of the 50 states and which is called program approval.

The procedure serves other purposes, foremost of which is the improvement of teacher education. For example, after an evaluation visit, programs identified as being of good quality are granted program-approval status. However, conditions are usually set which, when carried out, result in approval for additional programs. The net effect has been to bring about desirable changes in teacher preparation. Instead of depending upon credits on transcripts, a team of professionals makes pertinent observations and recommendations to the state education department. By recognizing the programs that have an acceptable rationale for not adhering to the letter of certification regulations, an opportunity for flexibility is provided without eroding standards. Whereas transcript analysis merely assesses quantity, program approval attempts to make a determination of the quality of the total program including general education, specific fields of specialization, professional education, and student teaching.

From this description of program approval, it would seem that it obviously should be the procedure to be utilized more widely in the future. Surely there is an advantage of on-site visits to college campuses for the purpose of assessment. And yet, all is not well. Serious problems exist. The procedure (i.e., of having teachers who are working toward advanced certification enroll in a program) was designed to prevent indiscriminate course-hopping: taking one course here, one course there, and one course back here, ad infinitum. This freedom, in the past, probably has been abused by teachers...hence, the concept of program approval, in which teachers must enroll in a program. On the surface, this seems like the thing to do. However, looking below the face of the issue, the requirement actually seems to restrict the individual freedom of movement of teachers. Perhaps a little course-hopping is not bad, particularly if it reflects the honest desire of a teacher to fashion an individualized, personalized, and self-directed inservice education program. Besides, there may be other ed-

ucational approaches more valuable than enrollment in a formal sequence of inservice courses. Unstructured workshops, sensitivity training, travel, and the like often cannot be forced into college and university programs unless they are highly innovative. Unfortunately, few are. At any rate, it is necessary for the AFT to seek a clear and moderate position on the many issues raised by this seemingly worthwhile approach to teacher certification.

THE AFT ROLE

• The purposes of certification and the role of the AFT. In light of Dr. Lierheimer's criticism, I believe we must clarify the role which we are to play in this critical area of education. We must face the issue not only of who shall determine certification standards, but also of what are the real purposes of certification. This question is far from being resolved.

Teacher certification procedures have been used with varying degrees of success for many decades in attempts to attain a variety of goals. The primary goal of teacher certification probably has been to prevent incompetent persons from becoming teachers. But some certification requirements have been included for other reasons. No matter how worthy these other reasons may have been when instituted, they have not always reflected this primary goal.

Some regulations, for example, were established in order to admit an adequately large pool of persons into teaching, so there were enough persons to manage all the classes in the state. This was a civil-service-type of approach to certification, in which requirements have been raised and lowered depending on the supply of and demand for teachers. When this is used as a goal of certification, it is obviously difficult to maintain the primary goal mentioned above, that of preventing incompetent persons from becoming teachers in the state.

Another goal established in some certification regulations is that of causing teachers to take "refresher" courses at colleges and universities. In Pennsylvania, as an example, the current requirement for permanent certification is that a person must take 24 semester hours of coursework (any kind of coursework) after receiving the baccalaureate degree. This goal is not necessarily related to the primary goal either, and can perhaps be better achieved by procedures or requirements other than in the certification process.

Other certification regulations and laws have been instituted by special interests to promote goals that have no direct relationship to teaching competence. Some of these requirements include United States citizenship, a course in state history, and a course in audiovisual techniques.

We must turn our attention to an exploration of these concerns. Similarly, we must consider the question, "Who shall determine standards?" In his book *Professional Problems of Teachers*, T. M. Stinnett (a longtime NEA operative) wrote at length on the role of the profession in certification. What he has to say has import for all teacher groups:

"These powers are responsibilities that have slowly developed for teaching, too. Although, presently, the responsibilities or powers are largely extralegal for the teaching profession, nevertheless, they are being exercised to some degree. In all but five states there now exists machinery by which the teaching profession exercises broad recommendatory powers regarding certification and preparation requirements. The machinery exists in the form of advisory councils on teacher education and certification, standing committees, and state examining boards. In 11 of these states, the body is established by law; in the remainder it is extralegal, having been established by the chief state education legal agency.

"Thus, the teaching profession is gradually moving toward a position to exercise powers and responsibilities over requirements for admission to practice as are the other professions. *Two developments are yet needed: the sanction of law, and the achievement by the profession of the ability and willingness to assume these functions.*"[12]

What will our role be in assuming these functions?

A certification proposal. I obviously cannot and do not wish to dictate AFT policy in this important area. I merely wish to present an alternative for the consideration of AFT policy-making bodies. In doing so, I must explain the work I was involved with in Pennsylvania prior to my joining the AFT in November, 1967.

When I served as an adviser in the Bureau of Teacher Education, Department of Public Instruction, I participated in a year-long review of certification. This review was conducted under the direction of Dr. Norman A. Miller, who was then the director of teacher education and certification.

Several fundamental assumptions about the goals of certification were formulated. The two most relevant ones were:

1. That the problem of adequate numbers of qualified teachers is not one to be solved through the manipulation of certification requirements. If certification requirements can, in fact, be made to describe the crucial behaviors that a person must be able to perform in order to satisfy adequately the professional responsibilities of the teacher, then the certification requirements should not be alerted simply in an effort to increase the supply of persons to keep order in classrooms. Changing certification requirements cannot change skills and knowledge needed for teaching competence. (The supply of qualified teachers might be altered by manipulating other variables; for example, increased teacher salary to attract more persons to teaching or back into teaching.)

2. That the continued updating of professional knowledge and skills is not a function that should be attempted through certification. Rather, it should come through personal initiative on the part of the teacher, motivated by such things as professional pride. Local, state, and federal inservice programs should all be available to upgrade and update teachers.[13]

A PROPOSAL

Dr. Miller and Dr. J. Ralph Rackley, then the state superintendent of public instruction, consolidated these positions and reported this thinking in a paper presented at the Seattle conference on the role of state departments of education in teacher education. Because their analysis is so significant, it, too, must be quoted at length.

"We [Miller and Rackley] have a genuine concern for the continuing professional education of teachers. Presently, in many states, teachers, by law or by state board regulation, must secure additional college credit in order to continue the initial teaching certificate in force or to make it 'permanent.' This practice involves a type of coercion that does not lead to professional responsibility. We believe the state should require superior college-level preparation for certification, provide for expert supervision of beginning teachers for a period of three years, and then remove itself from further certification activity. Local school systems...should provide the stimulus, where needed, to encourage teachers to continue their education for improved competence.

"The stamina and the dedication to complete three years of successful teaching, plus the optimum collegiate preparation necessary for regular initial certification, should be sufficient grounds for extending a certificate indefinitely. A regular certificate should normally be invalidated only in cases of malpractice or of nonpractice for an extended period of time. (The determination of appropriate continuing teacher education is not a function to be performed by the state department of education.) Such decisions can be made intelligently only at the local level. Compelling teachers to keep professionally current by means of certification regulations does not, in our view, normally solve the problems.

"We believe that this approach to continuing education for competence can be properly shifted to local school systems for the same reason we expect local systems to be able to assume a larger role in supervision of novice teachers: the school systems are becoming increasingly better organized and staffed. We also believe that placing this responsibility at the local level can have a desirable effect on the problem of misassignment of teachers.... Misassignment problems could be considerably relieved by proper kinds of inservice education."[14]

I offer for consideration a certification position in which licensing would be along the dual-step lines proposed above: The initial step would be to admit the apparently qualified teacher for a probationary period of three years. Then, at the conclusion of the three-year period, tenure would be granted to qualified teachers. The certification would then remain in force and effect unless dismissal procedures can be invoked under present statutory terms.

CONCLUSION

Harold Taylor, in his book *The World and the American Teacher*, wrote that "Certification is a bookkeeping problem and should be treated that

way" and that he would "like to see everyone in education spend a great deal less time discussing certification requirements and all the rules about them and free themselves for more time to raise questions about what they should be doing to make education interesting and engrossing to those undergoing it." He wrote, further:

"There is something about certification and licensure which, once it becomes ingrained in the consciousness of those who think in its terms, has the effect of narrowing the range of educational discussion into a set of details essentially unrelated to education itself. Like all modes of regulation, it comes at the subject it regulates in a essentially negative mood--it demands observance rather than inciting fresh action. It can, therefore, be used equally well as an alibi for the acquiescent or a club for the stern, a challenge for the rebel or a defense of the status quo.

"The fallacy in taking the whole apparatus of licensure so seriously is that education itself is already too formally conceived. What we need is not more rules and administration but more excitement."[15]

I believe the AFT should follow the excellent advice of Dr. Taylor as we explore these issues in our QuEST for a cohesive and consistent certification policy. In summary, I believe we must begin to probe the three basic problems raised here: (1) the fundamental issue raised by Michael Moskow on the relationship between local collective bargaining and certification standards; (2) specific policy matters, i.e., certification renewal, emergency certificates, certification by examination, etc.; and (3) the two general philosophic issues--the functions which certification should serve and our role as the teacher's union and how we can fulfill it.

Footnotes:

[1]Michael H. Moskow, *Teachers and Unions* (Philadelphia: Wharton School of Finance and Commerce, 1966), pp. 218-219.

[2]Alvin P. Lierheimer, "Give Up the Ship." Address prepared for the Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education and delivered on Feb. 3, 1968, at Boston University Law School.

[3]*Manual on Certification Requirements for School Personnel in the United States* (Washington, D.C., NCTEPS, 1967 edition), pp. 53-56.

[4]*Ibid.*, p. 21.

[5]*Ibid.*, p. 45.

[6]*Ibid.*, p. 27.

[7]*Ibid.*, p. 31.

[8]Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education, *Teacher Certification and Preparation in Massachusetts*. Report Number 1 (Boston: Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education, June, 1968), 132 pp.

[9]*Manual on Certification Requirements*, p. 33.

[10]Allan F. Rosebrock, "The Use of Proficiency Examinations in Certification." Paper presented at QuEST hearings on Aug. 21, 1968, at the AFT convention, Cleveland, Ohio.

[11]*Ibid.*, pp. 10-11.

[12]T. M. Stinnett, *Professional Problems of Teachers* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 3rd edition, 1968), pp. 435-436.

[13]"A Proposed Approach to a Review of Teacher Certification Regulations." Department of Public Instruction, Harrisburg, Pa. Working Paper, Dec. 8, 1966.

[14]Norman A. Miller, and J. Ralph Rackley, "Board Policy Concerns and Direction for a State Department of Education in Teacher Education." The Seattle Conference on the Role of the State Department of Education in Teacher Education (Olympia, Wash.: Department of Public Instruction, April 11, 1966), pp. 18-19.

[15]Harold Taylor, *The World and The American Teacher* (Washington: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, 1968), pp. 200-201.